Investigating the relationship between identity flexibility, identity complexity, and well-being

B099526

Word Count : 3,572

MSc Psychological Research

The University of Edinburgh

2017

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Dr. Sarah Stanton for her excellent supervision and guidance. She would also like to thank Dr. Steve Loughnan, Dr. Billy Lee and the PPLS postgraduate administrator and administrative assistants for helping to bring this study to fruition.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Identity malleability, one's ability to make part of their identity salient depending on context, has been linked to well-being in previous research (Rydell et al., 2009). However, these studies have focused on identity malleability in narrow areas (Dutton et al., 2010; Cheng & Lee, 2013). This study aimed to investigate the relationship between identity malleability and well-being at a chronic level. The study's secondary aim was to add in the effect of self-schema structure- known as overlap- as it is thought to affect identity malleability. Overlap and identity malleability were measured using the MULTIIS (Yampolsky et al., 2016) and a subset of MIM (Sanchez et al., 2009) scales, respectively, and well-being was measured using the Life Satisfaction (Deiner et al., 1985) and Perceived Stress scales (Cohen et al., 1994). Life satisfaction and perceived stress were correlated ($r= - .525$, $p<.001$), as were MULTIIS and MIM Scores ($r=.272$, $p<.001$). Malleability was not significantly correlated with either life satisfaction ($r=.038$, $p=.595$) or stress ($r= -.036$, $p=.642$), while overlap was significantly correlated with life satisfaction but not stress ($r_{lifeSat}= 246$, $p=.001$; $r_{Stress}= -.102$, $p=.158$). Similarly, linear models showed no predictive relationship between identity malleability and life satisfaction ($\beta_{two\ predictors}= -.031$, $p= .675$, $\beta_{three\ predictors}= -.030$, $p=.683$) or stress ($\beta= -.008$, $p=.911$, $\beta_{three\ predictors}= -.010$, $p=.898$). Overlap was a significant predictor of life satisfaction ($\beta_{two\ predictors}= .254$, $p= .001$, $\beta_{three\ predictors}= .255$, $p= .001$) but not stress ($\beta_{two\ predictors}= -.100$, $p= .185$, $\beta_{three\ predictors}= -.100$, $p= .184$). The combined MULTIIS and MIM scores – developed to see if the correlated identity measures could be used as one construct- was not a significant predictor of either ($\beta_{LifeSat}=0.31$, $p=.771$, $\beta_{stress} = -.033$, $p=.654$). These results suggest that identity malleability may be more usefully thought of in terms of its components and correlates, and that these may interact differently with different kinds of well-being.

Investigating the relationship between identity flexibility, identity complexity, and well-being

From Social Identity Theory to Identity Malleability

Social identities were first proposed as an important component of the self by Tajfel in 1979; this engendered what is now known as Social Identity Theory (Tajfel,2010). Social identity theory proposes that social identities are an important part of understanding oneself and can be a significant source of pride. A social identity can be thought of as the application of a group identity to the self. Self-Categorization theory expanded the tenets of Social Identity theory- which focused on group-level processes- to the individual level (Hornsey, 2008). Individuals see themselves as a part of a group and see the characteristics of the group as descriptive of themselves (Tajfel, 2010). The identity can be linked to any group membership that is meaningful to an individual, such as their racial identity, gender, or profession (Leach et al., 2008). The primary function of these identities is to divide the world into "them" and "us". These divisions are made along perceived group characteristics- or stereotypes- and help people process information about themselves and others more quickly than making decisions on and individual-by-individual basis (Sherman et al., 1998). Within and individual, social identities help people to find others like themselves and form communities (Haslam et al., 2012).

How a person sees themselves overall, their self-schema, was often thought to be homogenous, with each part of their identity mixed into a cohesive whole which made them inseparable (Onorato & Turner, 2004). This developed into the idea that self-schemata in general are multi-faceted, with each individual social identity represented in its own facet (Jones & McEwan, 2000). This path developed simply enough from the realization that people reported that they felt that multiple group memberships were important to them, such as being Hispanic and a woman. Indeed, individuals belonging to multiple minority groups experienced oppression in each (Reynolds and Pope,1991). This phenomenon, known as multiple oppression, lead Reynolds and Pope (1991) to propose four ways for an individual to reconcile being a member of multiple oppressed groups: identifying with one group solely from societal categorization, identifying with only one group by personal choice, identifying with multiple groups and moving between them, or identifying with multiple groups through integration into one inclusive identity.

Not only was this system likely to be more complex than was originally thought, but the structure of a person's self-schema is also proposed to be context dependent (Onorato & Turner, 2004). Reynolds and Pope (1991) first proposed in their third option of reconciliation in multiple oppression that individuals could move between their different social identities. It was found that cultural cues, such as group norms or stereotypes, are one powerful means of initiating the change in salience between different social identities (Cheng & Benet-Martinez., 2006; Bohner et al., 2008; Sinclair et al., 2006). The next step was to investigate the mechanism or mechanisms that allowed individuals to re-shape their self-schemas in response to their environment.

Identity malleability is the ability to make one facet of a person's self-schema more salient in response to environmental cues (Sanchez et al., 2009; Onorato & Turner, 2004). Most of the research in this area focuses on the shift associated with moving between the work and home environments or with bicultural identity integration (Dutton et al., 2010; Cheng & Lee, 2013). For example, a person will be more likely to think of themselves in terms of their profession and its characteristics while at work, but focus more on their identity as a parent when at home. The work on bicultural identity integration, or BII, investigates how individuals with multiple cultural identities identify as one of their cultures or as a separate "bicultural" identity, and the outcomes associated with this identification (Cheng & Lee, 2013). For example, Cheng and Lee (2013) found that the salience of strongly valanced (i.e. very positive or very negative) experiences of being a bicultural individual influenced integration: positive experiences increased BII while negative experiences decreased BII. There has been little research that looks at identity malleability at a chronic level. This approach would see identity malleability as a permanent attribute of an individual that is relevant in different domains (e.g. gender, national identity). The existence of identity malleability at the chronic level would help to explain how and why individuals are able to move between facets in different domains, such as identifying in terms of gender in one context and race in another. Therefore, research in this area would answer the questions originally posed in multiple oppression research- the foundation of this area- as well as add further detail to domain-specific areas related to malleability such as bicultural identity integration.

Identity and Well-being

Though social identities function primarily to differentiate groups in order to make comparisons quickly and easily, social identities can also influence both physical and mental well-being (Jetten et al., 2012). The community that develops from shared social identity-and the resulting support from this community-is one process thought to underlie the relationship between strong identification with a given group and greater well-being (Haslam et al., 2012). However, there are many routes through which the relationship between identity and well-being can work.

Stereotype threat is the feeling of being at risk of conforming to -usually negative- stereotypes in a given situation (Claude & Steele, 1995). This threat of failure at a task because of one's identity can greatly hinder performance on tasks, particularly when a social identity associated with a negatively-stereotyped group is made salient (Claude & Steele, 1995; Contrada et al., 2001). Lower maths test scores in women when gender is primed would be an example of this (Contrada et al., 2001).

Identity malleability is theorized to help people avoid stereotype threat by allowing an individual to move from a facet with a negative stereotype in an area to one with an advantage (Rydell et al., 2009). For an individual to be able to make parts of their identity more or less salient, their self-schema has to be divided into different facets. The number and structure of these facets are known as identity complexity (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Lower identity complexity is generally the result of a greater degree of overlap between facets. Overlap is how closely linked two or more parts of one's identity are. This can be measured in shared group-defining characteristics or in the number of shared members (Ellermers et al.,1999). Therefore, two groups though to overlap to a great degree could have a large number of members who are also members of the other group (i.e. PTA parents and carpool parents), or the stereotypes or values of eah group could be very similar (i.e. placing great importance on their children's' well-being and community bonding). A high degree of overlap is thought to reduce identity malleability by limiting the number of facets that a person can move between (Mok &Morris,2012; Yampolsky et al., 2013). Therefore, overlap and identity malleability should provide more insight into the relationship between identity and well-being than identity malleability alone.

The Present Research: Well-being and Identity Malleability

This study aims to measure identity malleability at the chronic level and investigate possible relationships between identity malleability and well-being. This study will define identity malleability broadly, in order to link existing literature which has focused solely in the areas of race or work/life balance (Cheng & Lee, 2013; Dutton et al., 2010). Here, identity malleability will be defined as reported changes in the relative salience of any given self-schema facets. Well-being will be measured using two scales, one for stress and one for life satisfaction, in order to give a more detailed picture of well-being. The author also aims to investigate whether overlap is linked to well-being, how this relationship compares to that between identity malleability and well-being, and how the relationship between identity malleability and well-being changes when overlap is considered. Overlap will be defined as the perceived similarity and connectivity between any self-schema facets. It is predicted that malleability and well-being will show the same relationship across well-being measures as seen in domain specific research, and that overlap will show a similar relationship with well-being but to a lesser extent.

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited via Prolific Academic. Any person 18 years old or older was eligible to participate in the study. In total, there were 194 participants; 195 participants consented to continue the study though one stopped after consenting to participate. There were 84 participants who identified as male, 87 who identified as female, two who identified as nonbinary/genderfluid/genderqueer, and one who responded "other" and wrote in their gender identity. In terms of racial or ethnic identity, 178 people identified solely as white, five as Black/African/Caribbean/Black British, ten as Asian/Asian British, and one as "other". Two people checked multiple boxes for their ethnicity: White, Asian/Asian British, and Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups. There were no participants who identified as Gypsy, Roma or Irish Traveller. Most participants identified as heterosexual- 176 people- five identified as homosexual, 12 as bisexual or pansexual, and one as asexual. No one responded with "other" or "prefer not to say".

Materials and Procedure

The study began with a few demographics questions. Participants were asked to report their gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation. The race/ethnicity options were standard for UK-bases censuses, with the addition of an "other" option that had a write-in box. Additional options, including an "other" write-in option, were included in the gender and sexual orientation questions to be more inclusive.

The Multicultural Identity Integration Scale

The demographics were followed by a subscale of Yampolsky et al.'s (2016) Multicultural Identity Integration Scale (MULTIIS). This scale was used to investigate identity complexity and overlap between different parts of one's self schema. Only items from the integration subscale were used, as these were most clearly related to social identity complexity and overlap than the categorisation and compartmentalization subscales. The MULTIIS subscale was comprised of eight items that were answered using a seven-point Likert-like scale ranging from 1 ("Not at All") to 7 ("Exactly"). Items included "The different parts of my identity fit within a broader identity" and "I draw similarities between the different parts of my identity" (see appendix 1). The MULTIIS subscale had robust reliability (α= 894).

The Malleable Identification Measure

An adapted version of Sanchez et al.'s (2009) Malleable Identification Measure (MIM) followed. The scale asked about identity malleability in terms of changes in response to different contexts. This original measure asked about racial identity specifically. The version used here was changed to ask about "parts of your identity" to be more universal, as this study is concerned with identity malleability at a

chronic level. For example, items included “in different situations, I will identify more closely with one part of my identity than another” and “one part of my identity may be more important than another in the moment depending on the people I am with” (see appendix 2). Participants responded to the five items within the measure using a five-point Likert-like scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 5(“Strongly Agree”). Like the MULTIIS, MIM was robustly reliable (α= .804).

The Satisfaction with Life Scale

Two well-being scales were used to form a more general picture of an individual’s well-being. The first is Diener et al.’s (1985) Satisfaction with Life Scale. This is a five-item scale designed to measure an individual’s judgement of their own life satisfaction. The scale asked to respond to 5 items such as “in most ways my life is close to my ideal” and “I am satisfied with my life” using a point Likert-like scale from 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 7 (“Strongly Agree”) (see appendix 3). The scale showed the most robust reliability of the measures used in this study (α= .913).

The Perceived Stress Scale

The Satisfaction with Life Scale was followed by the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen et al., 1994). This scale measures one’s reported level of stress in the past month using 10 items and a four-point frequency scale from 0 (Never) to 4 (Very Often). Two of the items were “in the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?” and “in the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?” (see appendix 4). The scale was strongly reliable (α= .882)

For all of the measures, all items correlated strongly with each-other and reliability would not be improved by the removal of any item in the scale (see appendices 5, 6, 7 and 8). All analyses were conducted using SPSS statistical software, version 24 (IBM Corp., 2016).

Statement of Ethical Approval

The study was granted ethical approval by the PPLS Ethics Committee of the University of Edinburgh, ethics application number 251-1617/1.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Scores on the MULTIIS subscale had a mean of 4.63 with a standard deviation of 1.04. The Malleable Identification Measure (MIM) had a mean of 3.90 with a standard deviation of 0.61. Scores on the Life Satisfaction scale had a mean of 4.35 with a standard deviation of 1.44. Perceived Stress scores had a mean of 1.73 with a standard deviation of .71 (See Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for all Measures

Measure	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Overlap (MULTIIS)	193	1.38	7.00	4.63	1.03
Malleability (MIM)	193	1.60	5.00	3.86	0.61
Life Satisfaction	193	1.00	7.00	4.35	1.44
Perceived Stress	193	0.00	3.60	1.73	0.71

Correlations

Overlap and identity malleability were correlated ($r=.272$, $p<.001$). Overlap was also moderately positively correlated with scores on the Life Satisfaction scale ($r=.246$, $p=.001$). Identity malleability was only significantly correlated with overlap.

Life satisfaction was moderately positively correlated with overlap, and was negatively correlated with stress ($r= -.525$, $p<.001$). This supports that individuals with high levels of stress are likely to report lower overall satisfaction with their lives. Life satisfaction was not significantly correlated with malleability. Perceived stress scores were only significantly correlated with life satisfaction sores.

Table 2

Summary of Correlations for Overlap, Malleability, Life Satisfaction and Received Stress

Measure	1	2	3	4
1. Overlap	-	.272***	.246**	-.102
2. Malleability	.272***	-	.038	-.036
3. Life Satisfaction	.246**	.038	-	-.525***
4. Perceived Stress	-.102	-.036	-.525***	-

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p< .001

Linear Regressions

A linear regression was calculated to predict life satisfaction based on the identity malleability and overlap measures (Table 4, Appendices 9 and 10). The predictors explained 25% of the variance in life satisfaction scores (R^2=.061, F (2,190) = 6.21, p=.002). Predicted life satisfaction scores were equal to 4.352+ .365 (overlap)- .044 (malleability). Participant's life satisfaction scores increased by .365 per unit increase in overlap scores, and decreased by .044 per unit increase in malleability. Overlap was a significant predictor of life satisfaction (β= .254, p= .001) while malleability was not (β= -.031, p= .675). A second regression added a combined measure consisting of overlap and malleability in order to test moderation (see table 3 and appendices 9 and 10). The regression using the three measures to predict life satisfaction was significant (R^2= .062, F(3,189)=4.145, p=.007) (Table 4). Life satisfaction scores are predicted to equal 4.345+ .365 (overlap) - .043 (malleability) + .025 (combined). Overlap was a significant predictor (β= .255, p= .001), while malleability (β= -.030, p=.683) and the combined predictor (β=0.31, p=.771) were not.

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Life Satisfaction (N=192)

	Model 1			Model 2		
Variable	β	SE	t	β	SE	t
Overlap	0.25**	0.11	3.48	0.26 **	0.11	3.48
Malleability	-0.04	0.11	-0.42	-0.04	0.11	-0.41
Overlap x Malleability				0.03	0.09	0.29

*p < .05, **p<.01, ***p< .001

A linear regression was calculated to predict stress scores based on the combined identity measures (Table 5, Appendices 9 and 10). The regression was not significant (R^2= .010, F(2, 190)= 1.005, p=.368). Neither overlap (β= -.100, p= .185) nor malleability (β= -.008, p=.911) were significant predictors. The three-predictor regression with stress as the dependent variable was not significant (R^2= .012, F(3,189)=.734, p= .533) (Table 5). None of the three predictors were significant ($\beta_{overlap}$= -.100, p= .184; $\beta_{malleability}$= -.010, p=.898; $\beta_{combined}$ = -.033, p=.654).

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Perceived Stress (N=192)

	Model 1			Model 2		
Variable	β	SE	t	β	SE	t
Overlap	-0.10	0.05	-1.33	-0.10	0.05	-1.33
Malleability	-0.01	0.05	-0.11	-0.01	0.05	-0.13
Overlap x Malleability				0.03	0.04	-0.45

*p <.05 **p< .01

Discussion

Interpretation of Results

The life satisfaction measures and identity measures were correlated with each other, as was expected. Perceived stress has been shown to be a moderate predictor of global life satisfaction in previous research, and a close relationship between the two is supported by the findings of this study (Hamarat et al., 2001; Malinauskas, 2010).

The lack of any correlation between malleability and well-being was surprising. This goes against past research that suggests a relationship between the two. An example that measured well-being in terms of avoiding stereotype threat demonstrated that making different facets of one's identity salient can reduce stereotype threat depending on the stereotype of that group for the task at hand (Rydell et al.,2009). This clearly shows that there can be benefits associated with malleability. However, the study measured malleability based on successful "switches", rather than as a pre-existing ability. Conversely, Sanchez et al. (2009) theorized that malleability within a given domain could cause instability in self-perception, which in turn would lead to lower well-being. While this is unlikely to be the case across domains, it would be worthwhile to see if instability related to malleability does influence well-being. In short, there may be a difference between the effects of identity malleability and well-being when malleability is activated and/or within a domain as compared to the relationship at a chronic level.

Overlap was likewise not originally thought to have as strong of an effect on well-being; this study hypothesised that self-schema structure was a moderator of the relationship between identity malleability and well-being rather than a mediator. Research in bicultural identity integration has shown that integration- a concept nearly identical to overlap - is linked to well-being. Indeed, identifying as one "bicultural" identity was more strongly related to well-being than having a multifaceted cultural identity (Yampolsky et al., 2013). Further studies may be interested in applying these concepts across domains and at the chronic level.

Overall, these results suggest that -rather than being a component of identity malleability equally important to any other- self-schema structure seems to be driving the relationship between identity malleability and well-being. While the correlation between malleability and overlap suggests that the two are linked, malleability may be made up of different parts which effect different outcomes. For example, overlap may be the part responsible for the relationship with general well-being while another may affect shorter-term stress levels. This could explain the lack of predictability for stress seen in this study. A multi-part structure of identity malleability seems more likely than identity malleability merely masking other

constructs due to the correlation between identity malleability and well-being, and the relationship between domain-specific malleability and well-being.

Guidelines for Future Research

While this study was unable to show the relationship between identity malleability and general well-being, it did support the author's second hypothesis that overlap plays a significant role in the relationship between identification and well-being. Measuring additional components or moderators of identity malleability would have improved this study. In order to fill this gap, future research should add in components from existing literature in this, and neighboring, areas in order add more detail to our understanding of identity malleability at a chronic level.

One way to measure identity malleability is to provoke a change in schema salience. This has been done by changing levels of processing and recalling positive or negative experiences associated with a facet (Mok & Morris, 2012; Cheng & Lee, 2013). This was not attempted in this study as our aim was to verify relationships at the chronic level, rather than in short-term changes. However, now that identity malleability can be measured at the chronic level, it would be useful to carry over these techniques from domain-specific malleability research to see if they apply more generally. It may also be useful to break down well-being into its constituent parts, as in this study the identity measures had different relationships with general well-being and stress. For example, studies linking identification and well-being and studies linking perceived stress and well-being both state that social support is closely linked to stress and life satisfaction (Hamarat et al., 2001; Malinauskas, 2010; Reicher, 2012). Adding a measure of actual and/or perceived social support to future studies would expand on the relationship between support and well-being previously studied in static models of identification. Resilience and coping resources- both resource usage and types of coping resources used- are other possible correlates of stress and life satisfaction of interest (Abolghasemi & Varaniyab, 2010; Matheny et al., 2002; Barnes & Lightsey, 2005).

Conclusion

Identity malleability at the chronic level is likely to be multifaceted and have more components than those studied here. Overlap has been shown to have a significant influence on well-being and to be correlated with malleability, though malleability and overlap have different effects on well-being. Similarly, different measures of well-being have had different relationships with each of the identification measures. Therefore, breaking down identity malleability and well-being into components investigated in domain-specific studies is the course of action most likely to elucidate identity malleability at the chronic level and its relationship to well-being.

References

Abolghasemi, A., & Varaniyab, S. T. (2010). Resilience and perceived stress: predictors of life satisfaction in the students of success and failure. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *5*, 748-752.

Barnes, P. W., & Lightsey, O. R. (2005). Perceived racist discrimination, coping, stress, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *33*(1), 48-61.

Beilock, S. L., Jellison, W. A., Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Carr, T. H. (2006). On the causal mechanisms of stereotype threat: Can skills that don't rely heavily on working memory still be threatened?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*(8), 1059-1071.

Bohner, G., Siebler, F., Gonzalez, R., Haye, A., Schmidt, & E. A. (2008). Situational flexibility of in-group-related attitudes: A single category IAT study of people with dual national identity. *Group Process Intergroup Relations*, 11(3), 301-317. doi: 10.1177/1368430208090644

Cheng, C., Lee, F., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Assimilation and contrast effects in cultural frame switching: Bicultural identity integration of cultural cues. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(6), 742-760.

Cheng, C. Y., & Lee, F. (2013). The malleability of bicultural identity integration (BII). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *44*(8), 1235-1240.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1994). Perceived stress scale. *Measuring stress: A guide for health and social scientists*.

Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., ... & Chasse, V. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*(9), 1775-1820.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 71-75.

Dutton, J. E., Roberts, L. M., & Bednar, J. (2010). Pathways for positive identity construction at work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social resources. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(2), 265-293.

Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P., & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (1999). Self-categorization, commitment to the group and social self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 371-389

Haslam, S. A, Reicher, S.D., & Levine, M. (2012). When other people are heaven, when other people are hell: how social identity determines the nature and impact of social support. In *The Social Cure* (pp. 21-37). Hove, East Sussex : Psychology Press

Hamarat, D. T.,Zabrucky,K.M. Steele, D., Matheny,K. B., Aysan, F. (2001). Perceived stress and coping resource availability as predictors of life satisfaction in young, middle-aged, and older adults. *Experimental aging research*, *27*(2), 181-196.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(1), 204-222.

IBM Corp. (2016). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Jetten, J., Haslam, C., Haslam, S. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2009). The social cure. *Scientific American Mind*, *20*(5), 26-33.

Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of college student development*, *41*(4), 405.

Leach, C. W., Van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., ... & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: a hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *95*(1), 144.

Malinauskas, R. (2010). The associations among social support, stress, and life satisfaction as perceived by injured college athletes. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *38*(6), 741-752.

Matheny, K. B., Curlette, W. L., Aysan, F., Herrington, A., Gfroerer, C. A., Thompson, D., & Hamarat, E. (2002). Coping resources, perceived stress, and life satisfaction among Turkish and American university students. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *9*(2), 81-97.

Mok, A., & Morris, M. W. (2012). Managing two cultural identities: The malleability of bicultural identity integration as a function of induced global or local processing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(2), 233-246.

Onorato, R. S., & Turner, J. C. (2004). Fluidity in the self-concept: the shift from personal to social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*(3), 257-278.

Reynolds, A. L., & Pope, R. L. (1991). The complexities of diversity: Exploring multiple oppressions. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *70*(1), 174-180.

Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *6*(2), 88-106.

Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Beilock, S. L. (2009). Multiple social identities and stereotype threat: imbalance, accessibility, and working memory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *96*(5), 949.

Sanchez, D. T., Shih, M., & Garcia, J. A. (2009). Juggling multiple racial identities: malleable racial identification and psychological well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *15*(3), 243.

Schmader, T., Johns, M., & Forbes, C. (2008). An integrated process model of stereotype threat effects on performance. *Psychological review*, *115*(2), 336.

Sherman, J. W., Lee, A. Y., Bessenoff, G. R., & Frost, L. A. (1998). Stereotype efficiency reconsidered: Encoding flexibility under cognitive load. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(3), 589.

Sinclair, S., Hardin, C. D., & Lowery, B. S. (2006). Self-stereotyping in the context of multiple social identities. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 90(4), 529.

Smith, T. B., & Silva, L. (2011). Ethnic identity and personal well-being of people of color: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58, 42-6.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *69*(5), 797.

Tajfel, H. (2010). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge University Press.

Yampolsky, M. A., Amiot, C. E., & de la Sablonnière, R. (2016). The Multicultural Identity Integration Scale (MULTIIS): Developing a comprehensive measure for configuring one's multiple cultural identities within the self. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *22*(2), 166.

Appendices

Appendix 1: MULTIIS Integration Subscale

This questionnaire looks at the different parts of your identity. While completing this questionnaire, please keep the following information in mind: a part of your identity refers to (1) the feeling of being a member of a particular group, and (2) the experience of aligning with values, beliefs, behaviours, etc. of a particular group. The following is a series of statements about how you see the different parts of your identity. Please read each item carefully. Please indicate how much each statement represents your experience using the following scale:

1 (Not at all), 2 (Slightly), 3 (A little), 4 (Moderately), 5 (Quite a bit), 6 (Mostly), 7 (Exactly)

	1- Not at All	2- Slightly	3- A Little	4- Moderately	5- Quite a Bit	6- Mostly	7- Exactly
The different parts of my identity fit within a broader identity	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The different parts of my identity are connected	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The differences between my parts of my identity complete each other	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The parts of my identity complement each other	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I have an identity that includes all the different	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	1- Not at All	2- Slightly	3- A Little	4- Moderately	5- Quite a Bit	6- Mostly	7- Exactly
parts of my identity							
The parts of my identity are all part of a broader group identity	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The parts of my identity are part of a more global identity	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I draw similarities between the different parts of my identity	○	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Appendix 2: Adapted Sanchez et al. Malleable Identification Measure

People's identities can change or shift depending on context. Different parts of your identity can be more or less relevant depending on the situation you are in. This questionnaire asks about the changes in your identity that you experience, if any, in different contexts. Please State the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below using the 5-point scale below.

	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neither Agree nor Disagree	4- Agree	5- Strongly Agree
In different situations, I will identify more closely with one part of my identity than another	○	○	○	○	○

	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Neither Agree nor Disagree	4- Agree	5- Strongly Agree
I often identify more with one part of my identity than another depending on the identities (e.g. gender, ethnicity) of the person/people I am with	○	○	○	○	○
Depending on the activity, I feel closer to one part of my identity than another	○	○	○	○	○
I feel that I adapt to the situation at hand by identifying as one part of my identity or another	○	○	○	○	○
One part of my identity can be more important than another in the moment depending on the people I am with	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix 3: The Satisfaction with Life Scale

Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

	1- Strongly Disagree	2- Disagree	3- Slightly Disagree	4- Neither Agree nor Disagree	5- Slightly Agree	6- Agree	7- Strongly Agree
In most ways my life is close to my ideal	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The conditions of my life are excellent	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am satisfied with my life	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
So far I have gotten the important things in my life	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix 4: The Perceived Stress Scale

The questions below ask about the frequency with which you have felt certain ways over the last month. Please respond using the scale below.

	0- Never	1- Almost Never	2- Sometimes	3- Fairly Often	4- Very Often
In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable	○	○	○	○	○

	0- Never	1- Almost Never	2- Sometimes	3- Fairly Often	4- Very Often
to control the important things in your life?					
In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed”?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside of your control?	○	○	○	○	○
In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you	○	○			

	0- Never	1- Almost Never	2- Sometimes	3- Fairly Often	4- Very Often
could not overcome them?					

Appendix 5:

Item-total Statistics for the MULTIIS Integration Subscale

Item	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Chronbach's α
Overlap 1	32.47	51.52	0.77	.87
Overlap 2	32.09	55.23	0.68	.88
Overlap 3	32.58	55.23	0.69	.88
Overlap 4	32.29	53.16	0.75	.88
Overlap 5	32.14	52.56	0.68	.88
Overlap 6	32.80	53.56	0.69	.88
Overlap 7	33.04	54.64	0.54	.90
Overlap 8	32.50	55.94	0.64	.89

Appendix 6:

Item-total Statistics for the Malleable Identification Measure

Item	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Chronbach's α
Malleability 1	15.38	6.02	0.70	.73
Malleability 2	15.48	6.70	0.48	.80
Malleability 3	15.41	6.32	0.57	.77
Malleability 4	15.56	5.94	0.62	.67
Malleability 5	15.31	6.56	0.60	.77

Appendix 7:

Item-total Statistics for the Life Satisfaction Scale

Item	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Chronbach's α
LifeSat 1	17.63	31.61	0.88	.87
LifeSat 2	17.24	35.29	0.78	.89
LifeSat 3	17.00	33.27	0.86	.88
LifeSat 4	17.06	35.30	0.73	.90
LifeSat 5	18.11	33.93	0.67	.92

Appendix 8:

Item-total Statistics for the Malleable Identification Measure

Item	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Chronbach's α
Stress 1	15.68	43.05	0.58	.87
Stress 2	15.43	41.74	0.63	.87
Stress 3	15.21	41.29	0.65	.87
Stress 4 (reverse)	15.78	43.48	0.52	.88
Stress 5 (reverse)	15.47	44.06	0.54	.88
Stress 6	15.84	39.36	0.70	.86
Stress 7 (reverse)	15.56	44.06	0.51	.88
Stress 8 (reverse)	15.50	42.49	0.62	.87
Stress 9	15.50	41.17	0.62	.87
Stress 10	15.89	39.27	0.74	.86

Appendix 9:

Model Summaries for All Models

Model	R	R2	Adj. R2	Std. Error of Estimate	R2 Change	F Change	df
LifeSat (2 p)	.25	.06	.05	1.34	.06	6.21	2
Stress (2 p)	.10	.01	.00	0.71	.01	1.01	2

LifeSat (3 p)	.25	.06	.05	1.40	.06	4.15	2
Stress (3 p)	.11	.01	-.00	0.71	.01	0.73	2

Appendix 10:

Model Change Statistics for all Linear Regressions

Model	df2	Sig F Change
LifeSat by Overlap and Malleability	190	.00
Stress by Overlap and Malleability	190	.37
LifeSat by Overlap, Malleability and Combined	189	.01
Stress by Overlap, Malleability and Combined	189	.53